UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,077	02/19/2004	Sylvic Demay	069208.0118	4531
23640 7590 01/09/2007 BAKER BOTTS, LLP 910 LOUISIANA			EXAMINER	
			HOEKSTRA, JEFFREY GERBEN	
HOUSTON, TX 77002-4995			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
·			3736	
SUMPTEMED STATUTOR	DA BEBIOD OF BESONIES	MAIL DATE	DELIVED	Y MODE
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		WAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/09/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		×				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/782,077	DEMAY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
·	Jeffrey G. Hoekstra	3736				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory provided to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re on. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. pply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on	19 October 2006					
· · · · ·	This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for all	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)	ndrawn from consideration.	· · ·				
Application Papers						
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Exa 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 19 February 2004 Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co 11)□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ on the drawing(s) be held in abeyan brrection is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ments have been received. ments have been received in A priority documents have been ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date)/Mail Date formal Patent Application 				

Art Unit: 3736

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/19/2006 has been entered.

Notice of Amendment

2. In response to the amendment filed on 10/19/2006, amended claim(s) 1, 20, and 23, canceled claim(s) 10-13, 15, and 17-19, and new claim(s) 27-28 is/are acknowledged. The current rejections of the claim(s) 1-9, 14, 16, and 20-26 is/are withdrawn. The following new and reiterated grounds of rejection are set forth:

Priority

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of excessive length (i.e. greater than 150 words). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Art Unit: 3736

Claim Objections

5. Claims 6, 21, and 25 are objected to because of the following informalities: the positive recitation of "a hollow guide" appears to duplicate the positively recited "a guide" structure claimed in claims 1, 20, and 25, respectively and/or is ambiguous.

Appropriate correction is required.

- 6. Claims 7, 22, and 26 are objected to because of the following informalities: the positive recitation of "a first and second set of projections" appears to duplicate the positively recited "a first set of projections... and a second set of projections" structure claimed in claims 1, 20, and 25, respectively and/or is ambiguous. Appropriate correction is required.
- 7. Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: the positive recitation of "at least one flexible projection" appears to duplicate the positively recited "a first and second set of projections" structure of claim 7 and furthermore appears to duplicate the positively recited "a first set of projections... and a second set of projections" structure claimed in claim 1 and/or is ambiguous. Appropriate correction is required.
- 8. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: the positive recitation of "the a first set of projections" appears to render the claim indefinite, is ambiguous, and/or a typographical error is present. Appropriate correction is required.

Application/Control Number: 10/782,077

Page 4

Art Unit: 3736

9. Claims 16 and 23 are objected to because of the following informalities: the positive recitation of "the collection bag" appears to lack antecedent basis and may render the claim indefinite. Appropriate correction is required.

- 10. Claims 16 and 23 are objected to because of the following informalities: the positive recitation of "the collection bag" appears to lack antecedent basis and may render the claim indefinite. Appropriate correction is required.
- 11. Claim 28 is objected to because of the following informalities: the positive recitation of "the needle" appears to lack antecedent basis and may render the claim indefinite. The Examiner notes the positively recited "the needle" structure is not present in independent claim 1, but alternatively in dependent claim 6. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 13. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 3736

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

- 14. Claims 1-9, 14, 20-22, and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mathias et al (US 6,387,086) in view of Eichhorn et al (US 4,320,769) as broadly as structurally claimed.
- For claims 1, 2, and 20, Mathias et al discloses a bag system for collecting a biological fluid (e.g. blood) (see Abstract) initially void of biological fluid, comprising:
 - a collection device (10);
 - a fluid collection bag (16) in fluid communication with the collection device;
 - a sampling device (18) in fluid communication with the collection device, the sampling device including:
 - o at least one sampling receptacle (70); and
 - o a transfer device (68 as best seen in Figure 4D) having an associating device (the inside faces of element 68);
 - wherein the associating device includes a guide (98 and 100) having a set of longitudinally disposed deformable projections (the inside face of elements 98 and 100).
- For claim 3, Mathias et al discloses a system, further comprising: a first tube (15)
 between the collection device and the fluid collection bag and a second tube (62)
 between the collection device and the sampling device.

Application/Control Number: 10/782,077

Art Unit: 3736

For claim 4, Mathias et al discloses a system, wherein the sampling device (18)
further comprises a sampling bag (42) connected to the downstream end of the
second tube.

Page 6

- For claims 5 and 21, Mathias et al discloses a system, wherein the receptacle (70)
 has a body having a first diameter and further comprises a closure element (84)
 having a second diameter greater than the first diameter.
- For claims 6 and 21, Mathias et al discloses a system, wherein the transfer device further comprises: said guide (68) open at a front part and a hollow needle (74 & Column 6, lines 52-55) in fluid communication with the bag system.
- For claim 14, Mathias et al discloses a system, wherein the guide further comprises a cap having a tamper-evident element (17).
- 15. Mathias et al discloses the claimed invention except for explicitly disclosing the guide having two sets of deformable projections distributed longitudinally on an internal face of the guide wherein a first set of the projections disposed near the needle is breakable under deformation. Eichhorn et al teaches a guide (10 and 100) having two sets of deformable projections (12 and 102) distributed longitudinally on an internal face of the guide wherein a first set of the projections disposed near the needle is capable of breaking under deformation and wherein a second set of projections is located near a front region of the guide (as best seen in Figures 2 and 10). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the fluid collection system as taught by Mathias et al, with the projections as taught by

Art Unit: 3736

Eichhorn et al for the purpose of increasing the efficacy of a bodily fluid withdrawal system to function safely with respect to the patient and caretaker.

- 16. Claims 16 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mathias et al in view of Eichhorn et al as applied to claims 1-9, 14, 20-22, and 27-28 above, and further in view of Ishida (US 5,125,920).
- 17. Mathias et al in view of Eichhorn et al discloses the claimed invention, as aforementioned, except for explicitly disclosing a collection bag and receptacle with at least two identification tags. Ishida teaches a identification tags disposed on the collection bag (25) and disposed on the receptacle (26 and 27 & Column 5, lines 16-23), wherein the tags allows the establishment, after their dissociation, that both the collection bag and receptacle originated from the same bag system (Column 5, lines 37-39). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the fluid collection system as taught by Mathias et al in view of Eichhorn et al, with identification as taught by Ishida for the purpose of increasing the efficacy of a bodily fluid withdrawal system to function safely with respect to the patient and caretaker.

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, 14, 16, and 20-28 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3736

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey G. Hoekstra whose telephone number is (571) 272-7232. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max F. Hindenburg can be reached on (571) 272-4726. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JH H